



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,635	12/12/2003	Krisztian Kiss	39700-793001US/NC39973US	1642
64046	7590	06/28/2010		
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C.			EXAMINER	
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER			NOORISTANY, SULAIMAN	
BOSTON, MA 02111			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2446	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/28/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/733,635	Applicant(s) KISS ET AL.
	Examiner SULAIMAN NOORISTANY	Art Unit 2446

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2010.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4,5,7-9,11,20,23 and 26-30 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,4,5,7-9,11,20,23 and 26-30 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No./Mail Date 2/18/2010

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No./Mail Date: _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

Detailed Action

This Office Action is response to the application (10/733635) filed on 3/31/2010

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-9, 11, 20, 23, 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Sanchez**, U.S. Patent App. No. **US 20020147845** in view of **NPL by Rosenberg 'Caller Preferences and Callee Capabilities for the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP)', March 2, 2003**.

Regarding claim 1, Sanchez teaches wherein a method comprising:

registering, in a controller entity is met here by sanchez ([0047; 0062-0063]
e.g., the CSCF (Service Requester Node) receives a REGISTER request (S-10)), **a plurality of contact addresses for a user** is met here by Sanchez ([0011] e.g., plurality of user identifiers under different service environments);

receiving, at the controller entity, a request for a communication link to the user is met here by Sanchez ([0046; 0012] e.g., call establishment 'e.g., receiving and processing service requests from a Service Requester Node or from another UDS in the resolution domain');

querying, by the controller entity, a database at a home subscriber server for information regarding a manner regarding how to handle the request is met

here by Sanchez ([0062] e.g., the CSCF preferably launches a query directly to the HSS (Server-3) (S-40)), **wherein the controller entity is implemented at a serving call state control function** is met here by Sanchez ([0066] e.g., S-CSCF 'the query is actually performed from a Serving Call Status Control Function (S-CSCF) entity').

However, Sanchez does not explicitly disclose the terms '*when a user preference for forking has not been included in at least one of the request or the registering, wherein said queried information indicates whether said request is to be forked at least one of in parallel or sequentially*';

'processing, at the controller entity, the request based on the queried information from the database, when a user preference for forking has not been included in at least one of the request or the registering'

'ROSENBERG teaches that it is well known to have system wherein '**when a user preference for forking has not been included in at least one of the request or the registering wherein said queried information indicates whether said request is to be forked at least one of in parallel or sequentially**' is met here by ROSENBERG (page. 6-8, Overview of Operation, Para. 4. section 7.2.2. Extracting Implicit Preferences, e.g., Proxies use the information in the Accept-Contact and Reject-Contact header fields to select amongst contacts in their target set. When neither of those header fields are present, the proxy computes implicit preferences from the request. These are caller preferences that are not explicitly placed into the request, but can be inferred from the presence of other message components);

'processing, at the controller entity, the request based on the queried information from the database, when a user preference for forking has not been included in at least one of the request or the registering' is met here by ROSENBERG (Overview of Operation, Para. 4. section 7.2.2. Extracting Implicit Preferences, e.g., If, and only if, the proxy did not find any explicit preferences in the request (because there was no Accept-Contact or Reject-Contact header field), the proxy extracts implicit preferences. These preferences are ones implied by the presence of other information in the request. For example, if the request method is INVITE, this is an implicit preference to route the call to a UA that supports the INVITE method) in order to make the system efficient. Thus it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to modify Sanchez invention by utilizing a system in which the called party to be able to manipulate callers request and redirect the responses back based on the callers request or preferences.

Regarding claim 4, Sanchez and ROSENBERG together taught the method as in claim 1 above. Sanchez further teaches wherein the registering comprises registering the plurality of contact addresses for the user in the controller entity which is provided in association with a multimedia network" ([0017] e.g., application server for multimedia).

Regarding claim 5, Sanchez and ROSENBERG, together taught the method as in claim 1 above. Sanchez further teaches wherein the registering comprises the user registering the plurality of contact addresses in at least two different communication

Art Unit: 2446

networks ([0011] e.g., plurality of user identifiers under different service environments; ROSENBERG: user registering plurality addresses [0002-0010]).

Regarding claim 7, Sanchez and ROSENBERG, together taught the method as in claim 1 above. Sanchez further teaches wherein the querying comprises applying a query to a sub-group of the known contact addresses (Sanchez: [0045] e.g., a UDS arranged for acting as an SLF comprises at least one Protocol Handler module for handling the received and answered queries from and to the CSCF node; ROSENBERG: user plurality addresses [0002-0010]).

Regarding claim 8, Sanchez and ROSENBERG, together taught the method as in claim 1 above, as described above. Sanchez further teaches wherein indicating and assigning handling instructions for at least one contact address independently during registration of the at least one contact address (Sanchez: [0011] e.g., plurality of user identifiers under different service environments; ROSENBERG: user plurality addresses [0002-0010]).

Regarding claim 9, Sanchez and ROSENBERG, together taught the method as in claim 1 above. Sanchez further teaches wherein the indicating and assigning comprises indicating and handling the handling instructions for the at least one contact address by either the user or the database ([0031; 0038; 0045] e.g., UDS may be assigned at the Service Requester Node for handling the service request related queries by given

means such as those carried out during discovery phase, during the start-up phase, or by configuration).

Claims 11, 20 have the similar limitation as of claim 1; therefore, it's rejected under the same rationale as in claim 1.

Regarding claim 23, Sanchez and ROSENBERG, together taught the method as in claim 1 above. ROSENBERG further teaches wherein the processing occurs in accordance with the information from the database if the request does not comprise any caller preferences, the caller preferences indicating if a request is to be forked in parallel or sequentially ([0002-0010] e.g., in case the fork-directive is set to "fork", then a parallel-directive indicates whether the caller would like the proxy server to proxy the request to all known addresses at once ("parallel"), or go through them sequentially, contacting the next address only after it has not received a final response for the previous one ("sequential")).

Claim 26-30 list all the same elements of **claim 1, 4-5, 7-9**, but in storage system rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to **claim 1, 4-5, 7-9** applies equally as well to **claim 23-30**.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim(s) 1, 4-5, 7-9, 11, 20, 23, 26-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sulaiman Nooristany whose telephone number is (571) 270-1929. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Pwu, can be reached on (571) 272-6798. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status

Art Unit: 2446

information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR: Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197.

Sulaiman Nooristany 12/04/2009

/KAMAL B DIVECHA/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2451